
3 9004 01378746 7
LP F5012 1900 L262
LP
F
5012
1900
L262

THE
SENATE DEBATES

FIFTH SESSION—EIGHTH PARLIAMENT

SPEECH

OF

HON. SENATOR LANDRY

AND

DEBATE ON THE MANITOBA SCHOOL QUESTION

OTTAWA, TUESDAY, JUNE 12, 1900

Hon. Mr. LANDRY rose to inquire:

1. Does the government know that the Catholic minority of Manitoba contends that it has been injured in the exercise of its rights with respect to the maintenance of its schools, and that it has demanded, as a remedy for its grievances, three things:

(a) Separate schools.

(b) A grant to sustain them.

(c) Exemption from taxes for the maintenance of Protestant schools?

2. By the judgment rendered on January 29, 1895, by the Lords of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council and by the order in council of Her Majesty the Queen in Council, dated February 2, 1895, is it decreed that the Catholic minority of Manitoba has just grievances, the redress of which, as a question of appeal to be decided, falls within the jurisdiction of the Governor General in Council?

3. Did the Governor General in Council, by an order dated March 21, 1895, order the legislature of Manitoba to modify its school legislation in such a way as to give the Catholic minority in Manitoba:

(a) The right to construct, maintain, furnish, manage, conduct and sustain Roman Catholic schools in the manner provided for by the Acts which the statutes of 1890 have repealed;

(b) The right to share in any subsidy made out of the public funds for the needs of public instruction;

(c) The right of the Roman Catholics who shall contribute to sustain the Roman Catholic schools to be exempt from all payments or contributions destined for the maintenance of other schools?

4. Has the legislature of Manitoba conformed with these prescriptions of the remedial order?

5. Has not the legislature, on the contrary, answered in the negative:

(a) By a first refusal given on July 25, 1895;

(b) By a second refusal given on December 21, 1895, rejecting an attempt at reconciliation;

(c) By a third refusal of the propositions made by the delegates sent to Winnipeg on March 28, 1896?

6. In the face of this triple refusal, did not the Conservative government propose for adoption by the Canadian parliament certain legislation, called remedial legislation, substituting the Canadian parliament for the Manitoban legislature in the measures of justice to be granted the Catholic minority of Manitoba for the redress of their grievances?

7. On March 22, 1896, did not the House of Commons accept the principle of federal intervention in the settlement of the Manitoba schools difficulty by adopting, by a vote of 112 to 94, the second reading of the Remedial Bill?

8. On April 14 of the same year, did not Sir Charles Tupper read to the House of Commons the following telegram from Monseigneur the Archbishop of St. Boniface, making known the adherence of the Catholic minority to the remedial measure:

Montreal, April 13, 1896.

In the name of the Catholic minority of Manitoba, that I represent officially, I ask the House of Commons to pass the whole Remedial Act as it is now amended. It will be satisfactory to the said Catholic minority, that will consider it as a substantial, workable and final settlement of the school question according to the constitution.

(Sgd.) ADELARD LANGEVIN.

9. Was not the final adoption of the Remedial Bill prevented only by an interminable discus-

sion, which was prolonged until the last days of parliament?

10. In the general elections of 1896, did not the Liberal party make to the electorate the solemn promise to render full and entire justice to the Catholic minority, as appears, amongst other things, by the following declarations published by the press and brought to the knowledge of the voters:

(a) Extract from a speech made by the Hon. Mr. Laurier at Jacques Cartier Hall, in Quebec, May 7, 1896, as published by 'L'Electeur' of May 8, 1896:

(Translation from the French.)

'Do not misunderstand my intentions. I repeat here that I wish the minority in Manitoba to obtain entire justice. It is a principle written in letters of gold in the programme of my party that the rights of the minority must be respected. . . . .

'If the people of Canada bring me into power, as I have a conviction they will, I will settle this question to the satisfaction of all parties interested. I shall have with me in my government Sir Oliver Mowat, who has always been in Ontario, at the peril of his own popularity, the champion of the Catholic minority and of separate schools. I will put him at the head of a commission where all the interests at stake shall be represented, and I affirm to you that I will succeed in satisfying those who are suffering at this moment. Is not Sir Oliver Mowat's name alone a guarantee of the success of this plan?

'And then, finally, if conciliation does not succeed, I shall have to exercise that constitutional recourse which the law furnishes, a recourse which I shall exercise completely and entirely.'

(b) Declaration signed by the Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick:

'Being sincerely disposed to put aside all party spirit and all questions of men, in order to secure the triumph of the Catholic cause in Manitoba, I, the undersigned, promise, if elected, to conform myself to the bishops' mandement in all points, and to vote for a measure according the Catholics of Manitoba that justice to which they have a right by virtue of the judgment of the Privy Council, provided that the measure be approved of by my bishop. If Mr. Laurier reaches power, and does not settle the question at the first session, in accordance with the terms of the mandement, I promise either to withdraw my support or resign.

'(Sgd.) C. FITZPATRICK.

'Ste. Marie, June 6, 1896.

'Copy compared with original.

'B. PH. GARNEAU, Priest.
'Secretary of the Archbishop of Quebec.'

(See also House of Commons Debates, 1897, page 163.)

(c) Declaration of the Hon. Mr. Geoffrion, published in 'Le Soir' newspaper, of Thursday, June 11, 1896, reproduced in the House of Commons 'Hansard' of 1896 (2nd session), page 230:

'I am here to make the declaration imposed upon me by my bishop in the mandement which has been read in all the churches of the province. That mandement presses upon the voters the duty of registering their vote only in favour of those candidates who shall take the solemn and formal pledge of supporting an adequate remedial law, restoring to the Catholic minority the rights which have been taken away from them. Now, gentlemen, I am here to publicly make in your presence the declaration imposed upon me by my bishop, and I now take before you a solemn pledge to that effect. I shall vote in favour of a remedial law such as required by the bishops, an operative law restoring to Catholics of Manitoba all the rights adjudicated upon by the Privy Council judgment, but at the same time I declare that I shall see to it that their rights and not crumbs be given back to them, for the Catholics do not ask charity, they are not mendicants, they claim their own rights.'

11. After the general elections, during the first session of the eighth parliament, did not the Hon. Sir Charles Tupper, the leader of the opposition, on August 24, 1896, from his place in the House of Commons, make the following declaration, to be found in the Official Report of the Debates of the House of Commons of Canada, vol. xliii., column 57:

'In the future, as in the past, the cardinal principle with the great party to which I have the honour to belong, will be: Equal justice to all, without respect to race or creed. I am glad to know that the responsibility of settling this question—an important question, although not so gravely important as I had supposed—I am glad to know that the responsibility rests no longer upon my shoulders, but upon those of the hon. gentleman who is now the First Minister of the Crown. I can only say that I trust and sincerely hope that he will be most successful in obtaining such a settlement of this question as will do justice and give satisfaction to all parties. I can assure the hon. gentleman not only that he has my most cordial wishes for a happy, and early, and fair settlement of this important question, but that anything that I can contribute to that end will be at all times most cheerfully done.'

12. Has the present government availed itself of this offer of the leader of the opposition, and has it profited by it to settle the Manitoba schools question in such a manner as to render justice to the minority?

13. If not, why not ?

14. Did the hon. the Secretary of State, on May 2, 1898, make the following declaration to the Senate:

'Hon. Mr. SCOTT.—The present government have settled the school question with Manitoba. They adopted the same channels to settle that question as the late government did. The late government sent delegates to Manitoba and had a conference and failed to come to any agreement. The present government had a conference with representatives of the government of Manitoba, and they came to an agreement, which was confirmed by the Manitoba legislature, and that is the end of it, so far as the public are concerned.'—(Senate Debates, 1898, page 663.)

15. Was not the Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier reported by 'La Patrie' of September 28, 1899, to have uttered at Drummondville, on September 26 last, the following words :—

(Translation.)

'You know that in 1896 an irritating question was causing trouble in the country. It was a question where religion and politics were confounded. We came into power. We have promised to settle the question in six months. You are witnesses that this promise has been fulfilled to the letter. The school question does not exist any longer, although our friends the Blues seek to bring it up again.'—(House of Commons debates, 1900, March 28, rev. ed., col. 2749.)

16. What is the position taken by the federal executive towards the parties in the case, the government of Manitoba of the one part and

the Catholic minority of Manitoba of the other part, in that understanding which was officially announced by the hon. the Secretary of States on May 2, 1898? Is it the position of a judge before whose tribunal the question in litigation had already been brought, and who had rendered a decision known as the remedial order?

17. Did the present government, when holding a conference with the government of Manitoba, simultaneously treat with the other party in the case, the Catholic minority?

18. Was that minority a party to the said conference, and has the arrangement which was made been accepted by the Catholic minority?

19. On the contrary, has not the arrangement in question been repudiated and denounced—

(a) By the head of the Catholic Church;

(c) By the Catholic minority of Manitoba ;

(b) By the episcopate ?

20. Has the government ever taken knowledge of the following words of Leo XIII., in his encyclical letter (' Affari Vos ', of December 8, 1897, concerning 'the understanding ratified by the legislature of Manitoba,' of which the hon. the Secretary of State speaks:

' The law which they have passed to repair the injury is defective, unsuitable, insufficient. The Catholics ask, and no one can deny that they justly ask, for much more. . . . . . . In a word, the rights of Catholics and the education of their children have not been sufficiently provided for in Manitoba.'—(See House of Commons Debates, 1898, column 5338.)

21. Is the government ignorant that the Canadian episcopate has pronounced in an unequivocal manner upon the value of the Laurier-Greenway arrangement, and has it read the following declarations:

(Translation.)

' (a) A new government replaced the old one, and one day we learned that between it and the government of Manitoba an understanding had come about. a compromise had been drawn up.

' This compromise was not the restitution of the violated rights, it was not even an amelioration which might be reconciled with the formal prescriptions of the church. How could the episcopate approve of it? It therefore declared it unacceptable, and the Catholics of Manitoba continued to maintain their own schools at the price of the greatest sacrifices.'

' The agreement effected between the federal authorities of Ottawa and the provincial government of Winnipeg, an agreement to which they would like to give the name of settlement of the school question, is declared ' (by the Holy Father) ' defective, imperfect, insufficient, and therefore cannot be accepted as an equitable solution of the question. It is, therefore, with reason that that agreement has been repudiated by the episcopate, and that the Manitoban minority would not submit thereto.'—(Pastoral letter of Mgr. Begin, dated January 6, 1898.)

(See also House of Commons Debates, 1898, column 5342.)

' (b) The negotiations which have taken place between the local authorities of Winnipeg and the federal authorities of Ottawa, have ended in an understanding which is given as the settlement of the grave school question. First of all, I protest against this word settlement. In a question in litigation, nothing is settled if the two interested parties do not agree at all between themselves.

' What is the contract that it is wished to impose upon us?

' The sum of the eight articles concerning religious instruction is the official proclamation of the principle of common and neutral schools. . . . . . Let me tell you immediately that common and neutral schools have been condemned by the church. . . . . . No Catholic, therefore, can approve of these schools unless he wishes to separate himself from the centre of unity.'—(Sermon of Mgr. the Archbishop of St. Boniface, dated November 22, 1896.)

'(c) As you know, quite as well as I, in spite of so many emphatic promises, the Manitoba school question has not been settled at all according to the rights of honour and justice. The understanding come to between the representatives of the central government of Ottawa and of the local government of Manitoba is only a sacrifice of the rights and interests of our co-religionists of this province, without an acceptable compensation. Also, have not the terms and conditions of this understanding, which is only a cowardly and shameful capitulation, accomplished in the shadows and in secret, been revealed to the public when its authors had acquired the certainty that the enemies of our religion and of our race would aid them to impose upon a minority which had been persecuted and despoiled for six years past. . . . Let it suffice me to draw your attention to the fact that the pretended settlement of the Manitoba schools question does not mean anything definite, but the criminal sanction of the establishment for the Catholics of this province, " of neutral schools," which the Holy Church has always repudiated and condemned.'—(Circular of Mgr. Blais, Bishop of Rimouski.)

' (d) Like my venerable colleagues, I do not hesitate an instant to disapprove of it absolutely myself (the Laurier-Greenway settlement), and I add, with Mgr. Begin, that no bishop will or can approve of the so-called settlement of the Manitoba schools question, which is not definitely based upon anything but an unjustifiable abandonment of the best established and the most sacred rights of the Catholic minority.—(Circular of Mgr. Laflèche, bishop of Three Rivers, February 11, 1897.)

' (e) All the bishops of Canada, after receiving the encyclical, ' Affari Vos,' unanimously repudiated and denounced the Laurier-Greenway arrangement in the terms employed by Mgr. Begin.'

22. Does the government not know that in a memorandum prepared for the Holy See by the Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, and signed by him, and bearing date November 23, 1896, it is written:

' The population of Manitoba at the last census was 152,506, of whom 20,571 were Catholics, disseminated over ninety municipalities.'—(See House of Commons Debates, 1898, column 5378.)

And is the government ignorant that out of these 20,571 Catholics of ninety different municipalities, only forty-one Catholics have made known their approval of the present Laurier-Greenway settlement in a document produced before parliament. whilst the Catholics of Winnipeg, Ste. Pierre Joly, Ste. Anne des Chênes, St. Charles, Lorette, Ste. Agathe, &c., have made indignant protests and passed resolutions condemning the pretended arrangement, copies of which protests and resolutions have been laid upon the Table of this House.—(See Document No. 35, second session, eighth parliament, 60-61 Vict., 1897.)

23. In the face of multiplied condemnations, does the government really think that an arrangement to which the Catholic minority has not even been a party, but which was concluded without its necessary participation, without its knowledge, and contrary to its interests, can be considered as an arrangement putting an end

to the Manitoba schools difficulty, as the government, by the mouth of the hon. Secretary of State, has declared it to be?

24. Cannot the present government, which has regarded neither pecuniary sacrifices nor the more severe sacrifice of human lives, when it was a question of causing a coercive policy to be adopted, and imposing by force of numbers on a South African people the obligation to grant British subjects advantages which they did not have, now find the moral sense, the energy and the means, and can it not submit itself to the imperative duty of imposing upon those who violate the treaties and misuse the constitution the obligation of respecting both, by granting the British subjects established in Manitoba the exercise of their religious rights, and especially of granting to fathers of families the sacred right of bringing up their children and having them instructed in conformity with the dictates of their consciences?

25. Does the government wish to continue to ignore the decrees of the Privy Council in England and the obligations of the remedial order, which exist in all their force and fulness, or does it intend to put them in force in accordance with the promise so to do, solemnly made to the electorate by him who is to-day Prime Minister of this country, and upon whom is incumbent the duty of safeguarding the rights of the minority and not prostituting the honour and dignity of the Crown?

I may also put the second question now, since it relates to the same subject:

1. Did the Governor General in Council, on the 21st March, 1895, render judgment upon the appeal brought before his tribunal by the Catholic minority in Manitoba, and is that judgment known under the name of 'The Remedial Order?'

2. Did not that judgment order the legislature of Manitoba to do justice to the recognized grievances of the Catholic minority of that province?

3. Has the legislature of Manitoba complied with that judgment, and has it remedied the grievances of the Catholics?

4. If justice has not been rendered to the minority injured in its rights, does the government intend to exact that the judgment rendered shall be executed, and is it going to take the steps to have it executed?

5. The case which this school question cause to rise having been appealed to the Federal tribunal, and a judgment having been rendered by that tribunal, is it not precisely upon that tribunal and upon no other that the obligation falls of causing its judgment to be respected?

6. When is the government going to cause the constitution and the judicial decrees to be respected, and when will the federal government, which, by law, is constituted the protector of the rights of minorities, treat this school question from the point of view of right and duty and not at all as a question serving as a stepping stone for certain politicians?

Hon. Mr. MILLS—I intend that the answer which I shall give the hon. gentleman shall be an answer to the series of questions which he has put and also to those questions which are still on the paper to be put to me, as they relate to the same subject and in order that there may be no misapprehension as to what my answer is, I shall read it to the House for its information. It is as follows: The hon. senator has put to me a very long series of questions containing a great many details. These questions do not relate to matters of information that are within my special keeping, or within the special keeping of the government, but with regard to what has transpired in the legislature of Manitoba, in the parliament of Canada in former times, in the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, and in the Privy Council of Canada.

The hon. senator, I think, entirely misapprehends the law of parliament in respect to questions put to ministers of the Crown. Sir Erskine May, in his 'Parliamentary Practice,' says: 'Questions addressed to ministers shall relate to the public affairs with which they are officially connected, to proceedings pending in parliament, or to any matter of administration for which the minister is responsible.' The questions which the hon. senator has put, do not come within any of these provisions of the law of parliament.

If the hon. gentleman is not satisfied with the settlement of the school question in Manitoba, he may, upon a substantative motion, bring the matter before the Senate for discussion. This he has not chosen to do, but to put a series of questions to me, as if I were a witness summoned before him for examination, compelled to answer questions relating to matters that are not before parliament. The matter about which the hon. senator makes inquiry in this long series of interrogatories, is one which led to a very great deal of acrimonious discussion, and to not a little political excitement; and as I am not seeking any official appointment at the hands of the hon. senator, nor do I know that any member of the government is, it is not necessary that I should undertake to pass an examination upon the list of questions which he has submitted to me, and to which he demands an answer. Every member of this House, including the hon. senator, knows something of the discussions that took place on the question of separate schools in Manitoba just as well as they are known to the government. The hon. senator has made long quotations from various speeches and papers, whether accurately made or not, I do not know. Nor is it at all my duty to

inquire for the purpose of answering the hon. member's question.

The hon. senator knows what the line of action, which was proposed by a former administration, was. He says that it was approved of by a majority of the members of the House of Commons in 1896. That may be so. But it did not become law. It was made an issue in the elections, and upon that issue those who favoured the policy which the hon. senator favours were, as a ministry, defeated, and a majority returned favourable to a different mode of settlement.

The hon. gentleman ignores the fact that Sir Charles Tupper has said on this subject: 'Under these circumstances, as I say, I find that I attached much greater importance to this question than the result of experience has shown to belong to it.'

Sir Charles Tupper, after the elections were over, also said that he was defeated by the division of his own party on this question, and that 'a large section of independent, intelligent, able men all over the Dominion thought that the government had taken a wrong step, and,' he added, 'I am not going into that question to-night, because it is a dead issue, and is past and gone, therefore there is no occasion to go into it.' The hon. leader of the Conservative party, in stating that it was a 'dead issue,' also intimated that he was not going to fight for a policy which those who were affected by it did not sustain him in pursuing.

In August, 1896, Mr. Taylor, the whip of the Tory party, at Owen Sound, said, 'the Conservative party is now through with remedial legislation.' He said: 'That the circumstances of this campaign were different from the last, as the Remedial Bill was no longer a part of the Conservative policy. Sir Charles Tupper had sent word by him to this effect to the electors of North Grey: That good feeling had now been restored between Sir Charles and Hon. Clarke Wallace and the other anti-remedial Conservatives.' And the Hon. Clarke Wallace said on the same occasion: 'It has been announced that the erroneous policy of forcing separate schools on Manitoba had been abandoned. The gentlemen who lent themselves to this policy were seeing the errors of their ways. He was rejoiced to know it; he would take them back into the Conservative party, and use them well.'

Mr. McLean, Conservative M.P. for East York, in speaking at Henley's school house, Grey County, in August, 1896, said that Sir Charles Tupper had personally informed him: 'We have got rid of the question of the Remedial Bill for ever.'

It is not necessary that I should undertake to discuss the Remedial Order, and the legal objections which may be made to the course of action therein suggested. The hon senator knows what the line of action was that was proposed by the present administration, and acted upon, in conjunction with the government of Manitoba. He knows that the entire Roman Catholic population outside of the city of Winnipeg have come under the provisions of the amended school law of 1897, which superseded the Act of 1890. It is reported to me that there were eighty-one (81) Roman Catholic schools outside of Winnipeg, and that all these have accepted the settlement effected by the Act of 1897, and have no desire to return to the condition of things existing before 1890. In the city of Winnipeg, in principle, the settlement has been effected. There has been some hitch in undertaking to carry out its details. My information is that under the Act of 1897, the trustees of the school in this city have not the power of binding themselves by compact, that none but Roman Catholic teachers shall be employed in certain schools. As a matter of fact, I understand they are prepared to do this, and this is, so far as I know, the only point at issue there, and, indeed, in the whole province.

I have no doubt that if the parties are left alone, this matter will be arranged, and the features of the settlement that may at the present moment be attended with some friction, within the city of Winnipeg, may be safely left to the softening influence of time, and to those concessions being made in a period of quiet which are not so likely to be carried out satisfactorily in a period of excitement. I am sure that the hon. senator's line of action upon this subject cannot be otherwise than injurious to the minority whose privilleges are affected. The course which the hon. gentleman is endeavouring to take, not in the interest of the minority, but most mistakenly with the view

of serving the interest of party, is one that is in the highest degree mischievous; and I feel that I best serve the public interest, and especially the interest of the minority, by declining to submit myself for an examination by the hon. gentleman in the various questions which he has proposed, but which are wholly outside of any right that the law of parliament confers upon him.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—If the hon. minister, who has just read his written answer, thinks that I am influenced by political motives, and not by a desire to serve the interest of the minority, he is mistaken. If he thinks his assertion is true, I might say that he opens himself to the same accusation in his answer to me. The answer given cannot come from the Minister of Justice, nor from a minister of the Crown ; it is the answer given by a man who puts aside all sentiments of justice and fair play to work in the interest of his own political party. That is what he does to-day in this chamber. And what do we see ? The Minister of Justice declares himself unable to ascertain if a speech made by the chief of his party, the Prime Minister of this Dominion, has ever really been delivered to the electorate of this country. He is unable to ascertain if declarations made by his colleague in this House, the hon. Secretary of State, are true or false. He is unable to ascertain if the voice of the Catholic minority in Manitoba has been heard in the councils of the nation. He is unable to ascertain all those things, but what he is willing to find out is what Mr. Taylor, Mr. Wallace and Mr. McLean said in different parts of the country. But why does he not tell us that those three men are precisely those who voted against the Remedial Bill in 1896 ? The principle of the Remedial Bill was adopted in the House of Commons on the second reading, and those three gentlemen, whose remarks have been quoted by the hon. Minister of Justice, are amongst the Liberals who voted against that measure. They were defeated, defeated with the Liberals who opposed the Conservative policy, and to-day the hon. Minister of Justice brings before this House the sayings of those gentlemen to prove what ? Is it to prove that justice has been done ? No. What does he want to prove ? I fail to see ; perhaps he does not see himself, but blinded by the interests of his party, he comes with quotations which set forth the views of those who were, like the honourable minister's friends, opposing the measure of justice submitted to parliament. But all what said those opponents are not at all satisfactory answer to the question. I claim that my questions are fully in line with all the authorities on the matter. I have alluded to a public question, and the hon minister ought to know or ought to acknowledge, because he knows better, that this Manitoba school question is still before the government. He ought to acknowledge that the government of this country, acting in a judicial manner, rendered a judgment. Has that judgment been complied with ? Is that judgment wiped away now ? It still remains, and is still an obligation resting on the ministry of the day, and it is their imperative duty to see that the judgment rendered by the judicial committee of their administration should be complied with. They have addressed themselves to the legislature of Manitoba. Manitoba gave its answer. Manitoba refused on three different occasions to comply with the judgment which has been rendered. That refusal placed the question in the hands of this parliament, and it is now the bounden duty of the ministry to see that the constitution of this country is vindicated—to see that the judgment of the Privy Council, in England, and of their own Privy Council should be executed. They have failed in their duty. They do not want to discharge their duty ? True, the hon. Secretary of State told us that the question was settled. settled by whom ? By a compromise that took place between whom ? Between the government, which was the judge, and the legislature of Manitoba, one of the parties. But where was the other party ? Was the other party asked to assent to that compromise ? Never. When the delegation, sent by the former government, left Ottawa, in 1896, and went to Winnipeg, to try and make a compromise which would be acceptable to both parties and acceptable to the minority, they failed in their mission, but their instructions obliged them to consult the minority and to assent to nothing that that minority would not be prepared to accept. Nothing of the kind was done by the present administration. This new government made a compromise, but made a compromise behind the back of the min-

ority, against their interest, without asking the interested party to accept or to refuse the compromise. What have we seen ? We have seen the Catholic minority rejecting that compromise, and to-day if the hon. minister is not deaf—if he wants to listen to the voice of the minority in Manitoba, he will hear the representatives of that minority crying out that justice has not been rendered yet. He will hear the representatives of that minority telling him that that question has not been settled yet. The hon. minister refers to what took place in the last election in the province of Quebec, but he seems to be mixed up and to ignore totally what took place. In our province the question put before the electors was very clear and well defined. The Prime Minister, at that time the leader of the opposition, said : 'Sir Charles Tupper and the Conservative party have tried to settle the Manitoba school question by a Remedial Bill, but that Remedial Bill was not worth the paper on which it was written. I will do better. I will give to the Roman Catholic minority of that province all its rights and if I cannot succeed by conciliation, I will have recourse to what the law empowers me to do.' The hon. gentleman promised the province of Quebec that he would do better than his predecessors, and the vote of the province of Quebec was given to Sir Wilfrid Laurier. Why ? Because he promised to do better than Sir Charles Tupper and the other leaders of the Conservative party. In the province of Quebec all the candidates of both parties were in favour of the remedies that were asked for the Roman Catholic minority in Manitoba. The elections of 1896 were not a condemnation of Sir Charles Tupper's policy. If Mr. Laurier secured a majority in his favour, it was solely because he promised that he would do more than Sir Charles Tupper had done, and yet the hon. minister says that the province of Quebec and the majority in the other provinces condemned the course taken by the late government. It might be that persons who know nothing may, at first sight, look at those elections as a condemnation, but how could they at the same time ignore that the people that were elected were obliged, in order to be elected, to sign a declaration by which they pledged themselves to grant more than was promised by the late government. Does the hon. minister ignore those facts ? If he ignores them, he is not fit to occupy the position he occupies as one of the advisers of the Crown.

Hon. Mr. MILLS—Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—If he does not ignore them, why does he try to-day, by his answers to serve the interests of his own party against all notions of justice, by a fantastical relation of facts which did not happen ? That Manitoba school question brought the hon. minister's party to power. We can see now in what way. The hon. gentleman says no. What was the division in all the Dominion ? Setting aside for the moment the province of Quebec, both parties in the rest of the Dominion were about equally divided. The majority gained by the government in the elections of 1896, was composed of precisely the majority obtained in Quebec. That was their position and we see now how their majority was obtained. Will the hon. gentleman now deny that he did not come into power solely by that question ? I will venture to make a prediction to the honourable minister ; I can tell him that he will go out of power on the same question. His party promised justice. What has it given ? It has given us stones in place of the bread promised not only to the people of Quebec but to all the provinces. Those flagrant violations of their most solemn pledges will turn against the Liberal party. The hon. ministers to-day are unable to face the situation. They have failed in all their efforts to try to remedy that question. And why ? Because they did not accept the offer made by them by the chief of the Conservative party in the House of Commons, when Sir Charles Tupper rose in his seat in the House of Commons to promise to the Prime Minister to give him all his help to settle that question. Here is without any possible doubt a question of public policy. It was put to the hon. minister, and I ask him why did not the Prime Minister accept this offer ? What is the answer of the hon. minister ? The only answer he gave was to tell us that Messrs. Taylor, Wallace and McLean have made certain declarations on another subject. We know all that, and it is a very childish answer from the Minister of Justice, who has a reputation to sustain, to come and tell us that the parties who are

against the Remedial Bill, who voted against the Remedial Bill, persist in the position they took at the time.

Hon. Mr. MILLS—They took Sir Charles Tupper back into the fold.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—He did not go back into the fold. He wanted and he offered to assist the Prime Minister and the hon. minister refused his help. The hon. minister may laugh, but is there any reason in that laughing ? Does he find his smile an intelligent one ?

Hon. Mr. MILLS—Yes.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—I am happy to hear that the hon. Minister of Justice is judge in his own case and that he finds when he laughs that his smile is very intelligent. If any one else does not give him that certificate, at least he finds in his conscience sufficient to tell him that he is intelligent. Where are the others who will find his smiles so intelligent ? I tell the hon. gentleman that the stand taken to-day by the ministry will be its own condemnation. They know they have not settled the question. They know they have refused the opportunity they had in their life to remedy the injustices perpetrated against the Catholics of Manitoba. The hon. gentleman might rise once more and recite one of the chapters of the book he has written on the Transvaal. He may boast of the willingness of his government or of the country to run to the Transvaal and take up arms and fight for the Uitlanders there. But we have Uitlanders here in Manitoba, and before going abroad to find grievances to be redressed why did not the government settle similar matters in this country ? I was very much amused the other day when the hon. minister said that a burgher had been condemned to pay a fine because he whipped a man, but that the government had taken money out of the public treasury to pay the fine at the expense of the public. But what do we see in this country ? Nothing else, or nothing less, when the ministers of the present administration are found remitting fines to persons who have violated the law of the Inland Revenue ? When they are remitting such fines what are they doing ? They are taking the public money to support their own friends and why ? Why should a man who is writing history, who is supposed to have the calm judgment of a historian, should come here and make out a great case against a foreign government when he is doing precisely the same thing ? I hope that the government will see its way to do justice. I hope against all hope that the government of the day, containing persons who, one day, pretended themselves so devoted to the interests of the minority, as the hon. Secretary of State, the hon. Prime Minister and the Minister of Public Works, did on more than one occasion will find out what are their present obligations and will be able to fulfil them. Let us all hope that if ever again a man like Sir Charles Tupper offers to aid them they will not commit the blunder to refuse such a help. In 1896, when the present administration came to power, they were offered the best opportunity to settle that school question immediately and for ever. Sir Charles Tupper had made of that school question a plank of his platform when he went before the people. The people who elected the supporters of Sir Charles Tupper had elected men who were naturally disposed to settle that question as the law of the country indicated, and these hon. gentlemen all were in the House of Commons, when Sir Charles Tupper offered his support and the support of his party to settle that question. Not a dissenting voice was heard. I say that the government of the day committed the greatest fault they could commit, in not accepting the aid of Sir Charles Tupper and of his party to settle that question definitely. The question is not settled, and it will not be settled if justice is not done to the minority. It is because they are a minority and have rights that the majority is bound to give them full protection. I hope that the people of this Dominion will see, not only by the events which have taken place, but especially by the answer given to-day by the hon. Minister of Justice, that no justice whatever will ever be rendered to them by the Liberal party. Such is the public declaration, made in this House to-day, by a man who is not, as his title should indicate, a distributor of justice, but who is degrading his position in playing the mean game of party interests.

